

May 16, 1995

TO: VG
FROM: GGG
RE: ACLU CONCERNS RE. DOWNTOWN BID

ACLU rep's. came to today's Council meeting re. proposed Downtown BID and raised concerns outlined in attached letter.

JG requests that our office (meaning you I suppose since your dealing w/ the BID) ask Alatorre's office about these concerns. She would also tag base w/ CD 9, but Walters is probably not amenable to open discussions on this or any other matter in general.

JG believes we should be aware and sensitive to these issues when we come forward with our BID.

Talked
to ACLU.
Filed w/ BID
stuff.



American Civil Liberties Union of Southern California

May 16, 1995

1616 Beverly Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA
90026-5752

tel: 213. 977. 9500

fax: 213. 250. 3919

The Honorable John Ferraro
President, Los Angeles City Council
200 North Spring Street, Room M30
Los Angeles, CA 90012

*ask Alatorres
office about this
BID downtown*

Dear Councilman Ferraro,

The American Civil Liberties Union of Southern California (ACLU/SC) opposes paragraph five in the proposed Downtown Property Owners Management District that would "control" and "deter" panhandling within the District. Proposals seeking to prohibit panhandling are unconstitutional, and are sure to be ineffective.

The ACLU/SC specifically opposes paragraph 5, section B, clause ii of the Management District plan. This proposal, if adopted, would create bike security patrols, one aim of which is to "control panhandling . . . and other unsuitable street behavior." Customer Service Ambassadors would also be hired to "deter . . . panhandling." The clear aim of these provisions is to, in effect, prohibit panhandling in the proposed district.

The state and federal courts have ruled that panhandling is protected speech in California. In 1983, the California Court of Appeals held that singling out and regulating speech that involves soliciting donations constitutes impermissible discrimination based on the content of speech (Alternatives for California Women, Inc. v. County of Contra Costa (1983)). Case after case follows this opinion (see Blair v. Shanahan, 1991).

Two weeks ago, in a case brought by the ACLU, a Federal District Court struck down an anti-panhandling ordinance. In Berkeley Community Health Project v. City of Berkeley, No. C95-0665, the Court found that begging is protected speech under the Liberty of Speech Clause in the California Constitution. Regulations that unreasonably burden or prohibit panhandling impermissibly "restrict speech based on content; that is, whether or not the speaker conveys the message of seeking contributions" (p.15). A federal court in Riverside made the same finding two months ago.

The courts are clear: the right of a person to say "I am homeless, please help me" is free and protected speech. Thus, the proposed Management District plan to "control" and "deter" panhandling is unacceptably vague and certainly unconstitutional.

President
Trisha Murakawa

Vice Presidents
Nancy Greenstein
Toni Cordero
Ellen Greenstone
Duncan Donovan

Secretary-Treasurer
Judith Glass

Asst. Secretary-Treasurer
Lloyd M. Smith

National Board Representative
Joyce S. Fiske

Executive Director
Ramona Ripston

Associate Directors
Sandra M. Jones
Elizabeth Schroeder

Controllor
Constance Maxey

Field & Legislative Director
Sam Mistrano

Events Director
Meegan Lee Ochs

Legislative Advocates
Francisco Lobaco
Valerie Small Navarro

ACLU Foundation

Legal Director
Mark Rosenbaum

Public Affairs
Allan Parachini, Director
Ann Bradley
Christopher J. Herrera

(page 2)

Panhandling restrictions involve pragmatic questions as well as constitutional ones. The ACLU believes that restrictions on begging actually worsen the overall business climate.

Potential customers are uncomfortable when police confront a homeless panhandler and order him away. Customers will be especially disturbed when private, unskilled security guards do that job. There is little doubt that many, if not most, of the confrontations between the "Customer Service Ambassadors" and homeless panhandlers will escalate and perhaps require police involvement.

Enacting irresponsible panhandling restrictions also has an unintended consequence: pushing the problem to other nearby neighborhoods. This is no way to handle the problem of poverty. Instead, the first step in dealing with panhandling is to develop a system of outreach, and offer services and other alternatives. We would be happy to meet with representatives of the City Council and of the proposed business district to work out a better solution.

We urge the City Council to amend Paragraph 5 in the proposed Management District to make it constitutional, and effective. Please call me at (213/977-9500 x261) if the ACLU/SC can help.

Sincerely,



Samuel Mistrano
Legislative Director

cc: City Council Members